



RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUN 18 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

TO:

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street SW

Washington, DC 20554

MI-B204

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I believe that the Commission's traditional goals—to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market—can only be served by retaining all of the current media ownership rules now under review. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is a central pillar of our democracy; the founders of the country believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If FCC policy changes to allow national media "market share" to be concentrated among still fewer "competitors," the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I strongly urge the FCC to pay attention to the public comments received at public hearings in Richmond, New York, Seattle, Durham, and hopefully in other cities around the nation. I think it is important for the FCC to consider not only the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

Thank you,

C. C. - [Signature]

FROM:

Mr. Charles Nafziger
3030 NW 66th St
Seattle WA 98117-6213



TO:

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

000000 000000 000000




I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I believe that the Commission's traditional goals—to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market—can only be served by retaining all of the current media ownership rules now under review. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is a central pillar of our democracy; the founders of the country believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If FCC policy changes to allow national media "market share" to be concentrated among still fewer "competitors," the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I strongly urge the FCC to pay attention to the public comments received at public hearings in Richmond, New York, Seattle, Durham, and hopefully in other cities around the nation. I think it is important for the FCC to consider not only the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

I thank you.

Charles C. Hopper

FROM:



Ms Mary A Rivard
3645 Whitman Ave N Apt 201
Seattle, WA 98103



TO:

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I believe that the Commission's traditional goals—to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market—can only be served by retaining all of the current media ownership rules now under review. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is a central pillar of our democracy; the founders of the country believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If FCC policy changes to allow national media "market share" to be concentrated among still fewer "competitors," the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I strongly urge the FCC to pay attention to the public comments received at public hearings in Richmond, New York, Seattle, Durham, and hopefully in other cities around the nation. I think it is important for the FCC to consider not only the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

Thank you,


D. J. G. /

FROM:



Janis Strout

1016 N 45th St Apt 1
Seattle, WA 98103-6671



TO:

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

1016 N 45th St Apt 1
Seattle, WA 98103-6671

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I believe that the Commission's traditional goals—to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market—can only be served by retaining all of the current media ownership rules now under review. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is a central pillar of our democracy. The founders of the country believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If FCC policy changes to allow national media "market share" to be concentrated among still fewer "competitors," the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I strongly urge the FCC to pay attention to the public comments received at public hearings in Richmond, New York, Seattle, Durham, and hopefully in other cities around the nation. I think it is important for the FCC to consider not only the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

Thank you,

James L. Strout

61016 1st 45th St #1, Seattle, WA 98103

FROM:

BEN CROTTY
4312 FRANCIS AVEN, APT. 102
SEATTLE, WA 98103



TO:

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

1 100 1 100 1 100


I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I believe that the Commission's traditional goals—to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market—can only be served by retaining all of the current media ownership rules now under review. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.


I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is a central pillar of our democracy; the founders of the country believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If FCC policy changes to allow national media "market share" to be concentrated among still fewer "competitors," the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I strongly urge the FCC to pay attention to the public comments received at public hearings in Richmond, New York, Seattle, Durham, and hopefully in other cities around the nation. I think it is important for the FCC to consider not only the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "R. J. C.", is written over a horizontal line.



02-277

NO Monopoly Media on the Public Airways

David H. Goshen